


REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 112, are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 60-64, 66-79, 81-87, 89-91 and 119-145 are present in this application. Claims 1-59, 80 and 88 were previously cancelled. Claims 92-118 were previously cancelled but were inadvertently listed as being withdrawn in the response to the previous Office Action. These claims had been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to non-elected groups. Claim 65 has been cancelled in this amendment.

Claim 60 has been amended to recite that the terminal group consists of the

formula , where each of the radicals X is a methyl group and to delete other possible definitions of X. Claims 66-68 have been amended to depend from claim 77. Claims 77 and 85 have been amended to recite the terminal group consists of the group of the claimed formula. Claim 89 has been amended to be in independent form and to recite the variable L represents an -alkyl-, -alkenyl- or -alkynyl- radical, each of which is optionally substituted by one or more substituents selected from -OH, -NRR', and -Oalkyl. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at least on page 8, lines 30-32.

Claims 119 - 145 have been added. Claims 119-126 are analogous to claims 61-64 and 66-68 and depend from claim 77. Claims 127-140 are analogous to claims 61-64, 66-70, 79 and 82-84 and depend from claim 85. Claims 141-145

recite that X is a methyl group in the dendrimers of claims 77, 85, 89, 90 and 91.

Support for this is found in the specification at least on page 3, line 7.

No new matter has been introduced as a result of the foregoing amendments.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) prior art rejections

1. Claims 60-65, 67-76, 78, 79, 81-84 and 89 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Caminade et al. (WO 00/53009) as shown in US 6,939,831.

It is well established that in order to demonstrate anticipation over 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each feature of the claim at issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. See, *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 218 USPQ 789 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claim 60 is directed to dendritic polymers comprising terminal groups of the formula $-P(=O)(OCH_3)_2$. Caminade does not specifically disclose dendrimers with the group $-P(=O)(OCH_3)_2$ as the terminal group. Therefore Claim 60 and claims which depend from claim 60 are not anticipated by Caminade.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not anticipated by Caminade et al. and the rejection should be withdrawn.

2. Claims 60, 62, 64-69, 77-79, 85-87, 90 and 91 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Killat et al. (US 4,871,779).

Killat relates to dense star polymers having at least one dendritic branch emanating from a core, with each dendritic branch having at least two terminal ion exchange moieties. (col. 2, lines 25-30).

The instant claims are directed to dendrimers comprising a terminal group, $-P(=O)(OX)_2$, at the end of each intermediate chain. The claimed dendrimers contain only one terminal group for each branch. Therefore the claims of the instant application are not anticipated by Killat because Killat does not disclose a single terminal group on each branch, but rather requires at least two terminal ion exchange moieties.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not anticipated by Killat et al. and the rejection should be withdrawn.

3. Claims 60-65, 68-76, 79, 81-84 and 89 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Caminade et al. (FR 2734268).

Claim 60 is directed to dendritic polymers comprising terminal groups of the formula $-P(=O)(OCH_3)_2$. Caminade does not specifically disclose dendrimers with the group $-P(=O)(OCH_3)_2$ as the terminal group. Therefore Claim 60 and claims which depend from claim 60 are not anticipated by Caminade.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not anticipated by Caminade et al. and the rejection should be withdrawn.


In view of the foregoing, it is believed that entry of the proposed amendments should be allowed and that the record rejections cannot be maintained against the proposed claims once entered into this application. Further, favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 4, 2010

By:



Gary D. Mangels, Ph.D.
Registration No. 55424

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620